



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/900,551	07/06/2001	Alicia Anne Chastain	RSW920010058US1	5014		
36736 75	90 10/20/2005		EXAMINER			
DUKE W. YE	DUKE W. YEE			LY, ANH		
YEE & ASSOC	IATES, P.C.					
P.O. BOX 8023	P.O. BOX 802333			PAPER NUMBER		
DALLAS, TX	75380	,	2162			
			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2009	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applicat	tion No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s) CHASTAIN ET AL.		
		09/900,	551	CHASTAIN ET AL			
		Examine	er	Art Unit			
	•	Anh Ly		2162			
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appears on the	ne cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ad	idress		
WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Marions of time may be available under the provisions IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common of the reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply ply received by the Office later than three months at patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF T of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nunication. atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNIC event, however, may a re will expire SIX (6) MON oplication to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this companies to the mailing date of this companies to the companies of the compa			
Status	·	,					
2a)□ ⁻ 3)□ \$	Responsive to communication(s) file This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	2b)⊠ This action is for allowance excep	non-final. ot for formal matte		e merits is		
Dispositio	on of Claims						
5)		24 is/are withdrawns/are rejected.		on.			
_	he specification is objected to by th		·				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 July 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
	the oath or declaration is objected to	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· .·	• •		
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	All b) Some * c) None of: I. Certified copies of the priority Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internations the the attached detailed Office actions	documents have be documents have be of the priority documental documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in A nents have been ule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National	Stage		
2) Notice 3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or	•	Paper No(s 5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)		
raper i	Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)						

Art Unit: 2162

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

- 1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' response filed on 08/09/2005.
- 2. Claims 13 and 24 have been cancelled.
- 3. Claim 15 was cancelled dated 02/11/2004.
- 4. Claims 1-12, 14, 16-23 and 25-27 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 23 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. (hereinafter Graham) in view of Patent No.: US 5,664,207 issued to Crumpler et al. (hereinafter Crumpler).

With respect to claim 1, Graham teaches a method in a data processing system for sharing text in an electronic book (displaying/selecting stored electronic document containing a plurality of pages with visual indications of the locations such as highlighting the text" figs. 2s', 3, 4 and 9's, col. 3, lines 18-67);

receiving a user input selecting the text from the electronic book to form selected text (using the mouse as input device for receiving the text from electronic document or e-book to form a selected text by highlighted the selected text after the e-book is displayed (fig. 1, item 36 or 30, fig. 2's item 220 and 224, col. 3, lines 56-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8); and

automatically sending the selected to each electronic document (fig. 8, the selected is automatically send to another user on the system: abstract, col. 6, lines 60-67 and col. 7, lines 1-5).

Graham teaches a method for highlighted or annotated text of stored electronic document or e-book, which contains plurality of pages including table of contents, receiving a user input via input device such as mouse or keyboard and highlighting the selected text after the e-book is displayed. Graham does not clearly teach a designated set of recipients in response to receiving the user input selecting the text.

Art Unit: 2162

However, Crumpler teaches automatically selecting for a designated set of recipients in response to receiving the user input selecting the text (fig. 6A, items 606 and 608, col. 3, lines 28-62 and col. 4, lines 38-56; also see col. 9, lines 32-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Graham with the teachings of Crumpler. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of a designated set of recipients in response to receiving the user input selecting the text as disclosed (Crumpler's col. 3, lines 45-62 and col. 4, lines 38-56), into the system of Graham for the purpose of automatically distributed the information to all the user in the communication network, thereby, automatic sharing of information is provided more efficient (Crumpler's col. 4, lines 38-56).

With respect to claim 2, Graham teaches a method in a data processing system as discussed in claim 1.

Graham teaches a method for highlighted or annotated text of stored electronic document or e-book, which contains plurality of pages including table of contents, receiving a user input via input device such as mouse or keyboard and highlighting the selected text after the e-book is displayed. Graham does not clearly teach displaying a list wherein the designated set of recipients is selected from the list.

However, Crumpler teaches set of recipients in the recipient's in-box and is displayed upon selection (col. 3, lines 28-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Graham with the

Art Unit: 2162

teachings of Crumpler. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of a designated set of recipients in response to receiving the user input selecting the text as disclosed (Crumpler's col. 3, lines 45-62 and col. 4, lines 38-56), into the system of Graham for the purpose of automatically distributed the information to all the user in the communication network, thereby, automatic sharing of information is provided more efficient (Crumpler's col. 4, lines 38-56).

With respect to claim 3, Graham teaches wherein the selected is highlighted text (col. 3, lines 56-65).

With respect to claim 4, Graham teaches wherein the highlighted text in a different color from unselected, bolded text, and text with a different font type from unselected text (col. 3, lines 56-67).

With respect to claim 5, Graham teaches storing the highlighted text in a data structure (in the user profile data structure: col. 5, lines 13-16).

HTML data structure: sections 0077 & 0186).

With respect to claim 7, Graham teaches wherein the text is a notated message of text in the electronic book (figs. 2s' and 9s').

With respect to claim 8, Graham teaches wherein the text is a highlighted passage of text in the electronic book (highlighting the text: col. 3, lines 56-67).

With respect to claim 9, Graham teaches wherein the sending step sends the highlighted text to the designated set of recipients using a communications link (figs 5 and 6A).

Art Unit: 2162

With respect to claim 10, Graham teaches wherein the sending step sends the selected text to the designated set of recipients in an electronic mail message (document in electronic form, fig. 5 and col. 4, lines 45-56).

With respect to claim 11, Graham teaches wherein the selected text is located in a body of the electronic mail message (figs 2s', 6s' and 5).

With respect to claim 12, graham teaches wherein the selected text is located in an attachment attached to the electronic mail message (figs. 2s, document containing image file, and col. 4, lines 45-56).

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program product in a computer readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected

Art Unit: 2162

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. (hereinafter Graham) in view of Patent No.: US 5,664,207 issued to Crumpler et al. (hereinafter Crumpler) and further in view of Pub. No.: US 20030206189 A1 of DeMello et al. (hereinafter DeMello).

With respect to claim 8, Graham in view of Crumpler discloses a method for identifying topics as discussed in claim 1.

Graham and Zimmerman disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Graham and Crumpler do not teach wherein the data structure is a download file.

However, DeMello teaches download/upload document 9section 0041).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Graham in view of Crumpler with the teachings of DeMello by incorporating the use of downloading the file. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of a designated set of recipients in response to receiving the user input selecting the text as disclosed (Crumpler's col. 3, lines 45-62 and col. 4, lines 38-56), into the system of Graham for the purpose of automatically distributed the information to all the user in the communication network, thereby, automatic sharing of information is provided more efficient (Crumpler's col. 4, lines 38-56).

Art Unit: 2162

9. Claims 14, 16-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,457,026 B1 issued to Graham et al. (hereinafter Graham) in view of Pub. No.: US 2004/0199529 A1 of Clark et al. (hereinafter Clark).

With respect to claim 14, Graham teaches a method in a data processing system for sharing text in an electronic book (displaying/selecting stored electronic document containing a plurality of pages with visual indications of the locations such as highlighting the text" figs. 2s', 3, 4 and 9's, col. 3, lines 18-67);

receiving a first user input selecting the text from the electronic book through a communications link to the data processing system (using the mouse as input device for receiving the text from electronic document or e-book to form a selected text by highlighted the selected text after the e-book is displayed (fig. 1, item 36 or 30, fig. 2's item 220 and 224, col. 3, lines 56-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8); responsive to user input and displaying the text (figs. 2s', 9s').

Graham teaches a method for highlighted or annotated text of stored electronic document or e-book, which contains plurality of pages including table of contents, receiving a user input via input device such as mouse or keyboard and highlighting the selected text after the e-book is displayed. Graham does not clearly teach sorting the selected text from the at least one remote electronic book using a selection criteria to form sorted text.

However, Clark teaches automatically organizing or sorting stored electronic message or document (abstract and sections 0002-0005).

Art Unit: 2162

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Graham with the teachings of Clark. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of organizing the stored electronic document and displaying the text as disclosed (Clark's sections 0002-0005), into the system of Graham for the purpose of automatically organizing the stored electronic document or electronic messages, thereby, searching the stored electronic document more efficient (Clark's section 0011 and 0015).

With respect to claims 16-17, Graham teaches a method in a data processing system for sharing text in an electronic book as discussed in claim 14.

Graham teaches a method for highlighted or annotated text of stored electronic document or e-book, which contains plurality of pages including table of contents, receiving a user input via input device such as mouse or keyboard and highlighting the selected text after the e-book is displayed. Graham does not clearly teach wherein selection criteria are used to sort and group the selected text, and wherein the selection criteria includes at least one of popularity, name of a user originating text within the selected text, and subject matter of portions or text within the selected text.

However, Clark teaches a set of search criteria 9sections 0012 and 0223).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Graham with the teachings of Clark. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of selecting of search criteria for thee stored electronic document and

displaying the text as disclosed (Clark's sections 0011 and 0223), into the system of Graham for the purpose of automatically organizing the stored electronic document or electronic messages, thereby, searching the stored electronic document more efficient (Clark's section 0011 and 0015).

With respect to claim 18, Graham teaches wherein the selected text includes passages from at least one remote electronic book (user over the Internet (col. 4, lines 45-67).

With respect to claim 19, Graham teaches wherein the selected text includes annotations made by a user (section 0209).

With respect to claim 20, Graham teaches wherein the selection criteria are received from a user input (fig. 1, using the mouse, item 36).

With respect to claim 21, Graham teaches wherein the selection criteria are received with the selected text (figs. 2A)..

With respect to claim 22, Graham teaches wherein the sorted text excludes a portion of the selected text (figs. 2s' and 9s').

Claim 25 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 14 hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2162

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV or fax to (571) 273-4039. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center (571) 273-8300

ANH LY CA OCT. 14th, 2005